



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/575,201

06/05/2006

Karlheinz Ulrich Gerhard Hahn

102792-567 (11337P4 US)

7110

27389 7590 08/12/2008
NORRIS, MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS
875 THIRD AVE
18TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10022

EXAMINER

ANTHONY, JOSEPH DAVID

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1796

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/12/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

FINAL REJECTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Umeda et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication No.: 2003/0052299A1 or Dumesnil et al. U.S. Patent Number 4,743,302 or Beck et al. U.S. Patent number 2,726,161.

Umeda et al. teach sintered body and high-frequency circuit component. Applicant's claims are deemed to be anticipated over the sintered bodies in Table 4 that contain in part in zinc oxide and bismuth oxide.

Dumesnil et al. teach low melting glass compositions. Applicant's claims are deemed to be anticipated over examples 1-8 that contain in part zinc oxide and bismuth oxide.

Beck et al. teach high-index glass elements. Applicant's claims are deemed to be anticipated over examples 14-18 in Table I that comprise in part zinc oxide and bismuth oxide.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dumesnil et al. U.S. Patent Number 4,743,302.

Dumesnil et al has been described above and differs from applicant's claimed invention in that there is no direct teaching (i.e. by way of an example) to a glass composition that comprise zinc oxide, bismuth oxide and an aluminum oxide. It would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use the disclosure of example 13 wherein aluminum oxide is used in combination with zinc oxide in a glass composition, as motivation to actually add aluminum oxide as an optional component to the zinc oxide and bismuth oxide containing glass compositions directly taught by the patent.

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-10, 12 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0 070 587.

EP teaches rinse aid compositions for automatic dishwashing machines that comprise surfactants, chelating agent, builders, and water-soluble salts selected from the group consisting of magnesium, zinc, tin, bismuth, titanium and mixtures thereof, see abstract, the bridging paragraph at the bottom of page 2 to the top of page 3, example 1 and claim 1. EP differs from applicant's claimed invention in that there is not a direct teaching (i.e. by way of an example) to a rinse aid composition that actually comprises both a zinc soluble salt and a bismuth soluble salt. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use the direct disclosure of the reference's claim 1, as strong motivation to actually make a rinse aid composition that comprised both a zinc soluble salt and a bismuth soluble salt. Furthermore, the courts have constantly declared that to employ two or more materials in combination for the same purpose they are taught as being individually useful is not patentable outside a shown of unexpected and superior results, see *In re Kerhoven*, 205 USPQ 1069 (CCPA 1980). The further inclusion of aluminum, as required in applicant's claim 18, is deemed

to be obvious over EP in light of EP's disclosure that aluminum salts are well known optional components in rinse aid compositions, see the bridging paragraph at the bottom of page 2 to the top of page 3.

Claims 1-5, 9-10, 12, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Huot U.S. Patent Number 6,344,295.

Huot teaches rechargeable cells employing mercury- and lead-free zinc-bismuth alloys as negative active materials are provided. Such cells demonstrate low after-cycle gassing, improved cumulative discharge capacities and initial discharge performances comparable to that of rechargeable cells that employ leaded zinc powders as negative anode materials, see abstract. Applicant's claims are deemed to be anticipated over claim 13 wherein an organic surfactant is used to coat an anode which consist of a zinc-bismuth alloy. Such a combination is deemed to inherently meet all the limitations of applicant's claims. In the alternative, applicant's claims are deemed to be obvious over Huot only because Huot does not directly disclose that his surfactant surfactant coated zinc-bismuth alloy are effective composition for protecting glassware. Such is deemed to be moot since the pending claims are composition claims and not method of use claims and as such the intended use of the composition is given little patentable weight.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-10 and 18-20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of copending Application No. 10/558,211. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because there is massive overlap in the claimed subject matter.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-10 and 18-20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4, 6-8, 10 and 12-14 of copending Application No. 10/468,669. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because there is overlap in the claimed subject matter in light of the specifications of both pending applications. See especially Table GL-1b on page 12 of 10/575,201 and the whole specification of 10/468,669 wherein the water-soluble glass compositions are disclosed to be useful in combination with detergents and other known components in rinse aids.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-10 and 18-20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7, 13-14, and 16-17 of copending Application No. 10/575,219. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because there is overlap in the claimed subject matter in light of the specifications of both pending applications. See especially Table GL-1b on page 12 of 10/575,201 and the whole specification of 10/468,669 wherein the water-soluble glass compositions are disclosed to be useful in combination with detergents and other known components in rinse aids.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/2/08 with the amendment have been fully considered but are not persuasive to put the application in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above. Additional Examiner comments are set forth next.

Applicant's assertion of unexpected and superior results for applicant's claimed invention over the applied reference to EP 0 070 587 are not accepted by the Examiner. The reason for this is that applicant's pending claims are nowhere commensurate in scope with applicant's showing. Applicant's Example 1 uses 0.67 g of zinc acetate, 0.19 g of bismuth citrate and 3.8 g of sodium disilicate. In the first place, applicant's independent claims do not require any sodium disilicate which was used in applicant's showing. Furthermore, applicant's showing had specific concentrations and ratios of the said three components which are found nowhere in applicant's pending claims. Finally, applicant's claims are drawn to specific species of zinc and bismuth salts and not to other metal salts or alloys or elemental metals of bismuth and zinc. As such, said showing is not probative of these claimed embodiments.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Examiner Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Joseph D. Anthony whose telephone number is (571) 272-1117. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon, can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The centralized FAX machine number is (571) 273-8300. All other papers received by FAX will be treated as Official communications and cannot be immediately handled by the Examiner.

**/Joseph D. Anthony/
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1796
08/04/2008**